

E 384


.3


.C285

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005025369





ESSAY

ON THE

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION,

THREATENED BY THE NULLIFIERS OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

"United we stand; divided we fall."

"Frenzied be the head—palsied be the arm, that seeks to destroy the Union."—Gen. Eaton, the hero of Derna.

"It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and INDIGNANTLY FROWNING UPON THE FIRST DAWNING OF EVERY ATTEMPT TO ALIENATE ANY PORTION OF OUR COUNTRY FROM THE REST, OR TO ENFEEBLE THE SACRED TIES WHICH NOW LINK TOGETHER THE VARIOUS PARTS."—General Washington's Farewell Address.

"While the Union lasts, we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant, that in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise. God grant, that on my vision never may be opened what lies behind. When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonoured fragments of a once glorious union; on states dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood!—Let their last feeble and lingering glance, rather behold the gorgeous *sign of the republic*, now known and honoured throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured—bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as, *What is all this worth?* Nor those other words of delusion and folly, *Liberty first, and Union afterwards*; but every where spread all over in characters of living light—blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea, and over the land, and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER, ONE AND INSEPARABLE."—Mr. Webster's reply to Mr. Hayne.

"The Union preserves us from wasting and destroying one another. It preserves relations of peace among communities, which, if broken into separate nations, would be arrayed against one another in PERPETUAL, MERCILESS, AND RUINOUS WAR. It indeed contributes to our defence against foreign states; but still more, IT DEFENDS US FROM ONE ANOTHER." * * * *"For ourselves we fear, that BLOODY AND MOURNFUL AS HUMAN HISTORY IS, A SADDER PAGE THAN HAS YET BEEN WRITTEN, MIGHT RECORD THE SUFFERINGS OF THIS COUNTRY, SHOULD WE DIVIDE OURSELVES INTO SEPARATE COMMUNITIES. We fear that our country, in case of disunion, would be broken into communities, which would cherish towards one another singularly fierce and implacable enmities."*—Christian Examiner, p. 148.

SECOND PART.

Third Edition, improved.

PHILADELPHIA :

PRINTED BY L. JOHNSON.

Oct. 3, 1832.

THE eyes of the civilized world are now directed towards the United States with intense interest. The despots, and friends of despotism, are elated with the hopes and the flattering prospect, that we shall be torn with factions—our government destroyed—and a full proof afforded, of the unholy doctrine that man is not made for self-government—a doctrine which goes far to justify all the arbitrary governments that have ever existed—or that now or may hereafter exist. On the other hand, the friends of genuine liberty and human happiness, whose hopes of good and rational government, have greatly rested on the result of our experiment, begun under such favourable auspices, are in deep gloom and anxiety, lest all their fond hopes and wishes should be disappointed, by our folly, or our madness, or both. The “long agony will soon be over,” as the nullifiers, having by infinite address and management, indefatigable exertions, and distribution far and wide, of their insurrectionary doctrines, wrought the people to a state of frenzy, are now driving matters to extremity, lest the effervescence should subside.

After having for months held out the delusive idea, that nullification was *the best mode of preserving the Union!!!* that it was *a peaceful remedy!!!* for all their grievances—after having thus brought the citizens, step by step, to the verge of the awful precipice, they presume there is no chance of retrocession, and throw off the disguise, and boldly and openly proclaim the necessity of a “*dissolution of the Union.*” Had they originally announced these views, they would have been frowned down into insignificance. But, well aware of this consequence, they concealed their ultimate views, until they had gradually excited the public passions to madness, and prepared the citizens for the most violent and destructive measures—

Sedition “is a monster of such mien,
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen :
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure—then pity—then embrace.”

The Columbia Times has recently sounded the tocsin, To your tents, O Israel. Let it speak for itself.

“*The Union of these states is now virtually dissolved, dissolved in the only place where it can be permanent, viz. in the hearts of the people. It is in vain to cry out for the preservation of the Union, when a century cannot eradicate the prejudices that already exist between the people of the North and South. Is it the nature of man to love his oppressor? Is it the nature of man to love the highwayman that presents a loaded pistol to his breast with one hand, while with the other he filches from his pocket the price of his hard industry?*”

“It may be asserted without the dread of refutation, that *to preserve the Union is to continue the tyranny of your oppressors, and to rivet the chains of slavery. The present is not a time for cold temporizing policy. All disguise should be thrown off, and patriotism, (as in the days that tried men’s souls,) should speak—THIS UNION MUST BE DISSOLVED.*”

“The line between the oppressors and the oppressed, is as distinctly marked out as that betwixt the American Colonies, and the Crown of Britain in 1776. The cases are the same. It is the government against the people. And it is not in the power of human reason to contravert it. *Let Tories and consolidationists cry “Treason !” “Treason !”* and at the same time remember, that the same

exclamation drowned the echo of the voice of Patrick Henry, when, with eloquence unequalled, he gave that first impulse to the ball of the revolution, which established, at least for a season, the liberty of America.

"I will not shrink from the responsibility of the assertion, that *the true policy of the South is, TO SEPARATE FROM THE UNION.* To continue in union, is to continue, like the fabled Atlas, to groan under the weight of a world on your shoulders."

We set a glorious example to the nations of Europe, which some of them eagerly followed, with at least equal zeal, but unfortunately, in most cases, with very unequal success. France, after the loss of above a million of lives, hundreds of millions of money, and two revolutions, appears to be under a government more arbitrary than that of Louis XVI. Spain, which at one time had a noble form of government, that guarded equally against the iron hand of despotism, and the lawless ravages of anarchy, has succumbed to the arbitrary sway of a despot, who, with base ingratitude, destroyed a large portion of the illustrious men who risked their lives and property, and spilled their blood, to pave his way to the throne. Portugal had for a short time, a free and liberal constitution, but has groaned for two or three years beneath the sway of a modern Nero or Tiberius. Italy made some noble efforts at the resuscitation of her ancient glory and liberties, which unhappily eventuated in the exile, the incarceration, in subterraneous dungeons, the cruel tortures, and the ignominious death of some of the most enlightened men of modern times. Poland, after the most heroic struggles in the same glorious cause, met with a still more lamentable fate. Not satisfied with the banishment of many of her noble defenders to the wilds of Siberia—the incarceration of others—the disgraceful execution of a portion—the janissary arrangement of scattering thousands of her children, through the provinces and among the serfs of Russia; the autocrat has blotted her out of the map of Europe. And to crown the whole, the late winds from Europe have brought us the appalling intelligence, that the mighty powers, Austria and Prussia, have conspired with the petty princes of Germany, to put down for ever all chance of liberation of that noble country, the birth place of some of the most exalted of the human race, almost without a hope of relief; for this unholy conspiracy has the command of such prodigious standing armies, as must be utterly irresistible by any of those desultory movements, which, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the people can adopt:—and as all despots make common cause, should the forces of Austria and Prussia be insufficient at any future day, to crush the rising spirit of Germany, those of Russia will be ready to unite with them in the unhallowed crusade against the imprescriptible rights of man.

And this is the auspicious moment which Governor Hamilton, ex-governor Miller, Mr. M'Duffie, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Hayne, Judge Cooper, and the party to which they belong, and whose movements they in a great degree decide, have selected to countenance, as far as in their power, the impious designs of the conspiring despots of Europe; to rend in pieces the glorious fabric of our government by repealing, by the *sic volo, sic jubeo* of a single state, a law of the U.

States enacted with all the formalities prescribed by the Constitution—a law of which the constitutionality has been duly recognised by the judiciary of the United States, the only tribunal competent to decide on it—a law the principle of which has been also recognised and advocated and strenuously urged on Congress by Gen. Washington, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and Mr. Monroe, and also ably supported by Mr. Ames, Mr. Clymer, Mr. Lowndes, &c. and more especially, in the most forcible and conclusive style, by Mr. Calhoun and Judge Cooper (now, by a strange change of opinion, among the warmest sticklers for the unconstitutionality of this law) and by successive Congresses for above forty years, during thirty of which its constitutionality was never called in question by any one, even of those who were violently opposed to many of its details:—in a word, to rise in rebellion against the national authority! and on grounds most severely reprobated by two of the leaders, Mr. M'Duffie and Mr. Hayne, in the year 1821.

And what are those grounds? Let us have them explicitly stated—

The doctrine in substance, (the phraseology is unimportant) is, that when a state believes a law unconstitutional, she may annul or “*nullify*” it within her own borders. This is nearly equivalent to the Polish *liberum veto*, the real source of all the calamities of that fine country for centuries, and which ultimately yielded her an easy prey to her rapacious neighbours. Instead of attempting myself a refutation of this disorganizing doctrine, which is utterly incompatible with the permanence of government, and which, had it been acted upon, in the progress of our affairs, particularly in the case of the alien and sedition laws, would, at an early stage of our career, have resolved our confederacy into its original elements, I shall place before the reader the irresistible arguments of an authority to which the most ardent nullifier in the nation cannot object:

“If, after the National Judiciary have solemnly affirmed the constitutionality of a law, it is still to be resisted by the state rulers, the constitution is literally at an end; a revolution of the government is already accomplished; and anarchy waves his horrid sceptre over the broken altars of this happy Union!”

“You assert that when any conflict shall occur between the general and state governments, as to the extent of their respective powers, “EACH PARTY HAS A RIGHT TO JUDGE FOR ITSELF!” I confess I am at a loss to know how such a proposition ought to be treated. NO CLIMAX OF POLITICAL HERESIES CAN BE IMAGINED, IN WHICH THIS MIGHT NOT FAIRLY CLAIM THE MOST PROMINENT PLACE. IT RESOLVES THE GOVERNMENT, AT ONCE, INTO THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICAL FORCE; AND INTRODUCES US DIRECTLY INTO A SCENE OF ANARCHY AND BLOOD. There is not a single power delegated to the general government, which it would not be in the power of every state government to destroy under the authority of this licentious principle.

“To suppose that the general government have a constitutional right to exercise certain powers, which must operate upon the people of the states, and yet that the government of each state has a right to fix and determine its own relative powers, and by necessary consequence, to limit the powers of the general government, is to suppose the existence of two contradictory and inconsistent rights. In all governments there must be some one supreme power; in other words, every question that can arise, as to the constitutional extent of the powers of different classes of functionaries, must be susceptible of a legal and peaceable determination by some tribunal of acknowledged authority; or force must be the inevitable consequence. And where force begins, government ends.”

The reader will find it difficult to believe—but strange as it may seem, it is nevertheless true—that these were the sentiments of Mr. M'Duffie in the year 1821! Comment on the enormous discrepancy between those sentiments and the insurrectionary doctrines now professed by this gentleman, in his public addresses, would be an insult to the understanding of the reader.

With the essays from which the above quotation is extracted, which were signed "One of the people," Major, now Governor Hamilton, was so enchanted, that he collected them from the newspapers, and published them in pamphlet form, with a strong commendation of their cogency and merits, of which the following forms a part:

"The argument of 'ONE OF THE PEOPLE' is now presented in an unbroken succession, familiar to the most ordinary, and gratifying to the most comprehensive understanding. THE TRUTHS THAT ARE UNFOLDED ARE IN THEIR NATURE ESSENTIALLY IMPERISHABLE. Whatever may be the fate of our National Charter, whether our descendants are long destined to admire and worship that solidity which may give duration to its existence, and those proportions that now confer grandeur on its design, or, in a far different mood, *to mourn over the ruins of so fair a fabric, equivalent testimony will be afforded of the sacredness of the principles that are here inculcated; of their faithful conservation in the first case, or of the disastrous and desolating violation and neglect they will have sustained in the last.*"

Few instances can be found in history, of a more lamentable inconsistency and change of sentiment, so fully fraught with the most mischievous consequences—a change from a rational, ardent defence of peace, good order, submission to government, and constitutional principles, to the open advocacy of principles subversive of all order, and leading most assuredly to a dissolution of the Union, and its certain attendant, civil war. When men of talents, influence, and indefatigable zeal* change their principles and adopt others diametrically opposite, according as times and their political views and prospects change—they are *ignes fatui*, calculated to lead nations to their ruin. Prudence, policy and sound sense proclaim them unsafe guides.

It is time fearlessly to call things by their proper names—and therefore I venture to assert, that nullification is incipient "*rebellion.*" Rebellion is defined to be, open or violent resistance to the lawful authority of a government. Nullification is resistance to a law enacted by the constitutional legislative authority of the United States. This is the first stage of rebellion. The second will take place, if the executive, as in duty bound, attempts to enforce the law; violent resistance being determined on in that case.

Omitting various conclusive arguments adduced in favour of

* The zeal with which the nullifiers are actuated, may be readily conceived from the fact, that they have printed in thirteen months 130,000 insurrectionary tracts, and, as I am credibly informed, have employed a number of propagandists to spread them over all the southern states. During all this time, the friends of peace and union in the middle and eastern states, have looked on with the most culpable and pernicious indifference, and made no effort to counteract the effect of those inflammatory publications—so much more ardour is displayed to overturn than to support the government. In a late statement I overrated the expense of those tracts, as they are by no means so large as I had supposed.

the constitutionality of the protecting system, the merits of the question may be rested on the clear, explicit and unanswerable admission of the Free Trade Convention, an authority, from which neither Governor Hamilton, nor Judge Cooper, nor Mr. M'Duffie, nor any of their friends, can appeal. That body stated that,

"They admit that Congress may COUNTERVAIL the regulations of a foreign power, hostile to our commerce."

Now I will assume, as a postulate, that if a foreign nation enacts "*regulations hostile to our commerce*," in the shape of prohibitions, or prohibitory duties, there is no possible mode in which we can "*countervail*" those "*hostile regulations*," but by the reciprocation of similar prohibitions or prohibitory duties.

Thus the case is simplified, and rendered level to the meanest capacity—and we have only to ascertain whether such "*hostile regulations*" of "*foreign powers*" do actually exist to an extent sufficient to justify our high duties. This is a point soon settled.

Almost all the nations of Europe exclude our bread stuffs, the chief dependence of probably 4,000,000 of our population, from consumption in their dominions, except in case of dearth, existing or impending. Now, I trust that no honourable man will deny that this is a clear and palpable "*regulation hostile to our commerce*," and would, if it stood alone, warrant, *according to the admission of the Free Trade Convention*, and to the eternal principles of justice and self-defence, not merely the very highest duties we have ever imposed on any of the articles we import from those European nations, but absolute prohibition—for instance, of the brandies, or wines, or silks of France—of the iron wares, or cottons, or woollens of Great Britain—of the fruits or wines of Spain—of the gin of Holland—of the hemp or iron of Russia. We, however, prohibit nothing. But the prohibitory duties of Europe are not confined to our bread stuffs. Every article with which they can dispense, with scarcely an exception, is in nearly the same predicament. Great Britain imposes a duty of about 100 per cent. on rice—1000 per cent. on our leaf, and 2500 per cent. on our manufactured tobacco—and on our lumber and various other articles, duties from 200 to 2000 per cent. more than on similar articles imported from her colonies!

It may not be unnecessary to state a few instances.

BRITISH DUTIES.

<i>From the United States.</i>		<i>From British Possessions.</i>
Olive wood, per ton	169s. 6d.	12s. 4d.
Oars, per 120	299s. 3d.	19s. 6d.
Spermaceti oil, per tun	532s.	1s.
Whale fins, per cwt.	1900s.	20s.
Gypsum, per ton	31s. 8d.	1s. 3d.
Copper ore, per cwt	12s.	1s.

These, out of fifty similar instances, are abundantly sufficient to prove the extreme inequality with which our trade is carried on with Europe, and to what a grievous extent we suffer from "*hostile regulations of foreign powers*."

And yet, *mirabile dictu*, we are threatened with rebellion because we impose duties on British Manufactures, which, except in four or five instances, do not average above twenty-five per cent.

Surely never was national delusion carried much farther, than in the senseless clamour with which the free trade presses have abounded for years on this subject.

No addition is necessary to the admission of the Free Trade Convention. It is decisive. But it cannot be amiss to add the conclusive reasoning of President Jackson, so often quoted, the force of which never has been and never can be impaired by the most talented advocate of free trade. Having premised that the states surrendered to the United States, the power of imposing duties on imports, "*with a view to the encouragement of domestic industry,*" he adds—

"If this power be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM WOULD THUS PRESENT THE ANOMALY OF A PEOPLE STRIPPED OF THE RIGHT TO FOSTER THEIR OWN INDUSTRY, AND TO COUNTERACT THE MOST SELFISH AND DESTRUCTIVE POLICY WHICH MIGHT BE ADOPTED BY FOREIGN NATIONS. This surely cannot be the case: this indispensable power, thus surrendered by the states, must be within the scope of the authority on this subject, expressly delegated to Congress."—*President Jackson's Message to Congress, Dec. 6, 1830.*

This overwhelming and unanswerable view of the subject is most earnestly and respectfully submitted to Col. Drayton, and the other leaders of the union party, who unfortunately believe in the unconstitutionality of the protecting system, and from that belief contend with their antagonists at an immense disadvantage.

HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Sept. 5, 1832.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION—No. IV.*

At the last session of Congress, the tariff of 1828 was discussed in the spirit of compromise, and numerous modifications were made, by some of which the interests of particular branches of manufactures were materially injured. It was fondly hoped that these modifications would allay the effervescence in South Carolina, and arrest the insurrectionary movements in that state. But unfortunately the expectation was vain—for the leaders have become more violent and more determined to carry into effect their destructive schemes.

We are gravely assured, and in a solemn appeal to the heated passions of the southern States, by citizens of high standing—Messrs. Hayne and Miller, of the Senate, and Messrs. M'Duffie, Davis, Felder, Griffin, Nuckolls, and Barnwell, of the House of Representatives, that the new tariff is more oppressive to the southern states, than that of 1828!!

"The burdens of the PROTECTING DUTIES are decidedly increased, estimating the cash duties and diminished credits at an average of more than fifty per cent.; while the duties on the unprotected articles, which, upon every principle of equa-

* This Essay was published about two weeks since, as No. III. and intended to close the series. But as some errors had escaped in it, and as it has been greatly improved in the arrangement; it is presumed that its republication cannot be improper, at present.

lity and justice, should sustain the principal part of the burdens of taxation, are, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, *entirely repealed*.

“Upon those manufactures which are received in exchange for the staple productions of the Southern States, THE AGGREGATE INCREASE OF THE BURDENS OF TAXATION, BEYOND WHAT THEY WERE UNDER THE TARIFF OF 1828, IS BELIEVED TO BE UPWARDS OF ONE MILLION OF DOLLARS !!! while the reduction or repeal of the duties on those imports which we receive in exchange for the productions of the Tariff States, [?] and are principally *consumed in those States*, [?] amounts to about four millions of dollars! While, therefore, the aggregate burdens of Taxation are diminished four millions of dollars by this Bill, *the positive burdens of the Southern States are not diminished at all, and their relative burdens are very greatly increased !*”—Address of Messrs. Hayne, Miller, McDuffie, Davis, Felder, Nuckols, and Barnwell, to the Citizens of South Carolina.

Let us test these confident statements by simple, undeniable facts :

1. Mr. M'Duffie has asserted, that the southern states pay forty per cent. of the impost. The reduction by the new tariff, is from 6 to \$10,000,000,—say the former sum. Forty per cent. on \$6,000,000, is \$2,400,000, reduced, if Mr. M'Duffie's own statement be correct, (and surely he at least cannot object to it) from the contributions of the southern states. Is this large reduction more burdensome to the South?

2. The debate on cotton bagging in 1824, occupied eight or ten days. It was asserted that the addition of a cent a square yard would operate most oppressively on the cotton planters, and, if I recollect rightly, would tax them to the amount of above 100,000 dollars annually. The duty is now reduced 30 per cent., from 5 cents to 3½. Is this more burdensome to the South?

3. By the tariff of 1828, baizes were estimated to have cost 50 cents per square yard, and were subject to 45 per cent. on that rate, or 22½ cents per square yard. By the new tariff they are subject to 16 cents per square yard; being a reduction of 30 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

4. By the tariff of 1828, blankets were subject to 38½ per cent. duty. By the new tariff, those which cost below 75 cents, are to pay 5 per cent. Those above 75 cents, pay 25; being a reduction of 90 per cent. on the former, and 35 per cent. on the latter. Is this more burdensome to the South?

5. Iron, in bars or bolts, is subject to \$37 per ton. It is in future to pay 30; being a reduction of nearly 20 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

6. Kendal cottons pay 14 cents per square yard, equal to about 60 per cent. They are to pay 5 per cent.; being a reduction of above 80 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

7. Brown sugar pays 3 cents per lb. It is to pay 2½. The reduction is 16 2-3 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

8. White, clayed, or powdered sugar pays 4 cents per lb. It is to pay 3½ cents per lb. The reduction is, 16 2-3 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

9. Teas of various kinds, pay duties averaging about 30 cents per lb. They are in future to be free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

10. Coffee paid 5 cents per lb. by the tariff of 1828—and by that

of 1830, one cent. It is now free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

11. Woollen goods, by the minimum arrangement of 1828, are subject to duties which might, and occasionally did, amount to upwards of 100 per cent. The minimum duties, which were more grievously complained of than any other portion of the tariff, are abolished, and the duty is 50 per cent. ad valorem. Is this more oppressive to the South?

12. Woollen goods not exceeding $33\frac{1}{2}$ cents per square yard, pay 14 cents per square yard, averaging from 45 to 50 per cent. They are to pay 5 per cent.; being a reduction of from 80 to 90 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

13. Bombazeens, Norwich crapes, &c. pay 36 per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent.; being a reduction of above 70 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

14. Silk goods from beyond the Cape of Good Hope, pay 36 per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent. From this side the Cape, they pay 22 per cent.; they are to pay 5 per cent. being a reduction of 70 per cent. in the one case, and 80 per cent. in the other. Is this more burdensome to the South?

15. Linens pay 27.5 per cent. They are to pay 15 per cent.; being a reduction of about 45 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

16. Hats, of Leghorn, straw, chip, &c. pay 55 per cent., besides a dollar minimum. They are to pay 30 per cent.; being a reduction of about 45 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

17. Wines, Madeira and Sherry, pay 50 cents per gallon. They are to pay 25 cents; being a reduction of 50 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

18. Wines, from France, red and white, averaged $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents. They are to average 4 cents; being a reduction of 66 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

19. Worsted stuff goods, viz. bombazets, ratinets, moreens, lastings, &c. pay $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent.; being a reduction of above 60 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

20. Hemp paid 60 dollars per ton. It is to pay 40; being a reduction of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

21. Wools, costing 8 cents per lb. paid, according to the tariff of 1828, 4 cents per lb., and 50 per cent. on the value. They are to be duty free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

22. Straw matting from China, of which large quantities are imported, pays at present 15 cents per square yard, equal to about 150 per cent. It is in future to pay 5 per cent.; being a reduction of about 145 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

23. Nankeens from China, pay at present 30 per cent.: by the new tariff they are to pay 20 per cent.; being a reduction of duty of 33 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

24. Window glass, 10 by 15, pays at present \$5 per hundred feet. It is henceforward to pay \$4; being a reduction of 20 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

25. Woollen hosiery, mits, gloves, &c. pay at present $38\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are in future to pay 25; being a reduction of about 35 per cent. Is this reduction more burdensome to the South?

26. Vessels of copper pay at present $38\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are to pay 25 per cent.; being a reduction of about 35 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

27. Hair cloth pays 33 per cent. It is to pay 15; being a reduction of about 60 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

28. Wool, above 8 cents per lb. paid 4 cents per lb. and 55 per cent. It is in future to pay 4 cents per lb. and 40 per cent. on the value; being a reduction on the ad valorem of nearly 30 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

29. Manufactures of wood pay 33 per cent. They are to pay 25 per cent.; being a reduction of nearly 25 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

30. Side and fire arms pay 33 per cent. They are to pay 25 in future; being a reduction of nearly 25 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

31. Adzes, axes, &c. pay $38\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are in future to pay 30; being a reduction of above 20 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

32. Cyphering slates pay $36\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are to pay 25 per cent.; being a reduction of 30 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?*

Here we see that various reductions have taken place, some 16 2-3, 20, 50, 70, &c. percent. on cotton bagging, blankets, baizes, Kendal cottons, woollen goods of low price, bombazeens, Norwich crapes, silks, linens, hats, wines, hemp, low-priced wools, straw matting, nankeens, woollen hosiery, vessels of copper, adzes, axes, &c. &c. most of them articles of general use in the Southern States; and yet we are assured that the new tariff is more burdensome on the South than the old!!!! And Mr. Hayne, in his late address has stated, that

“The general character of the Bill was manifest on its face. It had clearly aggravated the inequality and injustice of the system, by greatly reducing or taking off entirely the duties on the unprotected articles, while **THE DUTIES ON THE PROTECTED ARTICLES REMAINED SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME!!!**”

And again:

“Duties to the amount of \$3,000,000 on the unprotected articles, have been entirely repealed—and upwards of a million more taken off, while *the duties on the protected articles have remained substantially undiminished!!!*”

How stupendous the infatuation and excitement that could lead a towering mind into such an egregious error!

To the articles at present exempt from duty, the following are to be added, from the 3d of March, 1833.—Cocoa, almonds, currants, prunes, figs, raisins, black pepper, ginger, mace, nutmegs, cinnamon, cassia, cloves, pimento, crude saltpetre, flax unmanufactured, quicksilver, opium, quills unprepared, tin in plates and sheets, unmanufactured marble, argol, gum Arabic, gum Senegal,

* The existing duties in the above list are stated as actually paid—that is to say, the ten per cent added at the custom house to the amount of the invoice, is here added to the duty. By the existing arrangement a nominal duty of 30, is really a duty of 33 per cent.

epaulettes of gold and silver, lac dye, madder, nuts and berries used in dying, saffron, turmeric, woad and pastel, aloes, ambergris, Burgundy pitch, Peruvian bark, cochineal, capers, chamomile flowers, coriander seed, cantharides, castanas, catsup, chalk, coculus Indicus, coral, dates, filberts, filtering stones, horn plates for lanterns, ox horns, India rubber, ipecacuanha, ivory unmanufactured, juniper berries, musk, nuts of all kinds, olives, oil of juniper, paintings and drawings, rattans unmanufactured, reeds unmanufactured, rhubarb, rotten stone, tamarinds, tortoise shell, tin foil, shellac, sponges, sago, lemons, limes, pine apples, cocoa nuts and shells, iris or orris root, arrowroot, sal ammoniac, colombo root, annatto, anniseed, oil of anniseed, oil of cloves, cummin seed, sarsaparilla, balsam tolu, assafetida, ava root, alcornoque, canella alba, cascarilla, Haerlem oil, hartshorn, manna, senna, tapioca, vanilla beans, oil of almonds, nux vomica, amber, platina, busts of marble, metal or plaster; casts of bronze or plaster, strings of musical instruments, flints, kelp, kermes, pins, needles, mother of pearl, hair manufactured, hair pencils, Brazil paste, tartar crude; vegetables, such as are used principally in dying and in composing dyes, &c. &c. And further,—All articles not enumerated in this act, and which are now liable to an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent. (except tartar emetic, Rochelle salts, sulphate of quinine, calomel, corrosive sublimate, sulphate of magnesia and glauber salts,) are henceforth free of duty. Are these exemptions more burdensome to the South?

It is confidently asserted by the nullifiers and their friends, that the alteration of the currency of the pound sterling from 444 cents to its real value, 480 cents, and the reduction of the credits from an average of about ten months to four, more than countervail the reduction of the duties, and thus render the new tariff more burdensome than the old!!! Let us test this assertion by figures:

We will take £1,000 sterling worth of adzes, axes, &c. which pay 30 per cent. under the old tariff, and will pay 25 per cent. under the new.

1828.		1832.	
£1,000 equal to	\$4444 44	£1,000 equal to	- - \$4,800 00
10 per cent. added,	444 44		
	<u>4,888 88</u>	Duty 25 per cent.	- - 1,200 00
		Difference in favor of importer,	<u>237 66</u>
Duty 30 per cent.	- - 1,466 66		
Deduct 6 months' discount, at			
4 per cent. per annum,*	29 00		
	<u>1,437 66</u>		<u>1,437 66</u>
£1,000 worth of hosiery at 35 per cent. at present.		At 25 per cent. in future.	
£1,000, equal to	- \$4,444 44	£1,000, equal to	- - \$4800 00
10 per cent. added,	- 444 44	Duty 25 per cent.	- - 1,200 00
	<u>4,888 88</u>	Difference in favor of importer,	<u>476 88</u>
Duty, 35 per cent.	- 1,711 10		
Deduct 6 months' discount,	34 22		
	<u>Net duty</u>		<u>\$1,676 88</u>
	- \$1,676 88		

* The discount allowed for prompt payment by government is only 4 per cent. The credit formerly averaged 10 months; at present it is only four, for all except woollens, on which there is no credit: making a difference of six months against the importer, under the present tariff, compared with the tariff of 1823—and of the whole ten, in regard to woollens.

It must not be overlooked, that the alteration of the value of the pound sterling affects no imports but those from Great Britain, and even of those none but such as are subject to ad valorem duties.

Philad'a. Sept. 8, 1832.

HAMILTON.



DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.—NO. V.

Here it is proper to make a solemn pause on the very verge of a tremendous precipice, one desperate plunge into which would lead to civil war with all its fearful aggregation of horrors. We find eight citizens, ranking among the first in the land, promulgating a document which is regarded—perhaps intended—as a signal to invite a single state to resist laws duly enacted by a majority of the representatives of the whole Union—a resistance which is neither more nor less than rebellion—and this measure is urged on a ground, which, when fairly examined, vanishes, “*like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leaves not a trace behind.*” The assertion, that the new tariff is more burdensome to the South, than the tariff of 1828, is, as we have seen, not only unsupported by fact, but is most unequivocally contradicted by fact, and utterly destitute of the shadow of foundation.

I will not allow myself to believe that these gentlemen attempted wilfully to deceive the public. Their characters place them too high for such a suspicion. But that they have laboured under an hallucination as complete as any of those above alluded to,* will hardly be denied.—And unhappily, an error on such an important subject, resulting from a want of careful investigation, may produce as fatal results, as an egregious, wilful misstatement. That these gentlemen have been most culpably remiss in committing themselves by such an erroneous document without due investigation, will not admit of a moment's doubt. And is it not highly probable—nay, almost certain—that when they have thus egregiously erred on a simple question of matter of fact, where the error was discoverable in five minutes' examination, they have fallen into equal errors in those metaphysical abstractions and dogmatic opinions which they and their friends have promulgated on this momentous subject, by which the passions of the citizens of South Carolina have been roused to madness, and a portion of the state made ready “*to renew the bloody scenes of the revolution?*”

What a melancholy view this circumstance presents of human affairs! On what slender threads the peace and happiness of nations depend! Here are, I repeat, eight citizens, who, from station, cultivation, and standing, are arrayed in the front ranks of society, who, for want of proper investigation, have sanctioned with their honoured names, what is thus plainly and irrefutably proved to be not only not true, but the reverse of truth, of which the direct tendency is to destroy the peace and happiness of 13,000,000 of souls and their descendants—to array father against son, son against father, and brother against

* See page 16.

brother—to make a jubilee for the friends of despotism throughout the world—to cover the friends of mankind with gloom and horror—and finally to give strength to the sickening and appalling maxim, that man is incapable of self-government! Alas! for human nature!



It now remains to sum up, in brief, the leading heads of this mighty question, so as to place it in a *coup d'œil* before the reader.

1. The first Congress embraced some of the members of the federal Convention, who in Congress zealously advocated the protecting system, and must have known the intent and meaning of the instrument they devised themselves.

2. The second act of that Congress, declared in its preamble,

“Whereas it is necessary for the support of government—for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the ENCOURAGEMENT OF MANUFACTURES, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandize imported.”

3. All the Congresses from the year 1789, to the present time, have enacted protecting duties, and generally by considerable majorities.

4. For thirty years the constitutionality of the system was never once called in question.

5. Judge Cooper and Mr. Calhoun, now among the most zealous opposers of the system, on the ground of unconstitutionality, were its ardent advocates; the former in 1813, and the latter in 1816!!

6. Mr. Lowndes, as pure, as sound, and as enlightened a statesman as ever lived, advocated, in 1816, the minimum duty on Cottons, the highest duty ever imposed in this country before 1828, and also the protection of woollens.*

7. Six of the eight representatives from South Carolina, Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Lowndes, Mr. Mayrant, Mr. Middleton and Mr. Woodward, voted for that duty.

8. Four Presidents, General Washington, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, urged the protecting system on Congress.

9. Can it for a moment be pretended—can the most ardent, unflinching, and determined nullifier, venture to assert—that Gen. Washington, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Mr. Lowndes, Judge Cooper in 1813, and Mr. Calhoun in 1816, were less gifted, less sagacious to expound the constitution, or less attached to its spirit, than Mr. Hayne, Mr. Calhoun and Judge Cooper, in 1832?

10. Mr. M'Duffie, in 1821, published a most overwhelming and unanswerable refutation of the doctrine of nullification.

* “Mr. Lowndes entered into AN AMPLE AND PARTICULAR DEFENCE OF THE SYSTEM REPORTED ON THE SUBJECT OF COTTONS, by the Committee of Ways and Means.” *National Intelligencer*, March 22, 1816.

“Mr. Lowndes observed, that he believed THE MANUFACTURE OF WOOLLENS, AND PARTICULARLY OF BLANKETS, REQUIRED A DECIDED PRESENT ENCOURAGEMENT.—*Idem*, March 27, 1816.

11. Governor (then major) Hamilton, republished this refutation, with the highest approbation, declaring that "*the truths it contains are IMPERISHABLE.*"

12. Both those gentlemen, together with Mr. Calhoun and Judge Cooper, who are now united in urging resistance to the government, were in the prime of life, with their faculties perfectly matured, when they advocated doctrines, the antipodes of those they advocate at present.

13. Can it be admitted, for a moment, that they were not as fully competent to decide on the rights and duties of the States, in 1821 as they are in 1832?

14. In consequence of our dependence on Europe for blankets and clothing, our armies suffered more during the early part of the last war for the want of those articles, than from the enemy.

15. The country suffered intense distress from the close of the late war, till the close of the year 1823, when we enjoyed what may be called free trade; that is, when our duties were low, and calculated almost altogether for revenue.

16. Since the year 1824, when the protecting tariff went into operation, the country has been uniformly prosperous, except in the bubble year 1825.

17. Nothing will satisfy the nullifiers, but such a reduction of duties as would ruin hundreds of thousands of their fellow citizens. The most embittered enemy could not display more deadly hostility, than they do against those fellow-citizens.

18. The tales of the distress said to exist in South Carolina, are put down by last year's message of the governor, which congratulates the legislature on the prosperity of the state.

19. Intense distress, far more than is asserted to exist at present, prevailed in that state from 1819 till 1823, before either of the obnoxious tariffs was passed; and therefore it was manifestly unjust, and calculated to lead the people astray, to charge any present distress, real or supposed, to the account of the tariffs of 1824 and 1828.

20. The charge of the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, producing distress and suffering, was the origin of all the disaffection and the insurrectionary spirit that prevail in South Carolina, and are spreading elsewhere—and though fully proved to be destitute of the shadow of foundation, its effects continue with unabated virulence.

21. The proceeds of the exports of South Carolina at present, are as great as they ever were since 1819, and her citizens purchase every article they want, whether foreign or domestic, at reduced prices, from 10 to 30, 40 or 50 per cent. Of course, they must be far more prosperous than they were before the enactment of those tariffs.

22. Almost every article, without exception, that has been duly protected, has been improved in quality and reduced in price.

23. While we are daily stunned with clamours about the danger of consolidation, the general government has been repeatedly bearded by some of the states—so that, as Mr. M'Duffie has justly observed,

"WE HAVE MORE CAUSE OF APPREHENSION FROM THE STATES, THAN

FROM THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT—OR, IN OTHER WORDS, THERE IS, IN OUR SYSTEM, A GREATER TENDENCY TO DISUNION, THAN TO CONSOLIDATION.”

24. Mr. M'Duffie and his friends appear disposed to prove the truth of this position.

25. The duties on at least 30 protected articles, are reduced from $16\frac{1}{3}$ to 145 per cent. by the tariff of 1832; and yet we are assured *it is more burdensome to the South than that of 1828!!*

26. The impost is reduced, 6 to \$10,000,000, and yet the complaint is as great as if there were no reduction made.

27. As our bread stuffs are generally prohibited in Europe, unless in case of dearth—and as enormous duties are imposed on our rice, tobacco, lumber, &c. &c. our duties, are perfectly justified by the doctrine of the Free Trade Convention, that “*Congress may countervail the regulations of foreign powers hostile to our commerce.*”

28. Flour, when the bushel of wheat averages in England 5s. $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. sterling, pays a duty of about 81 per cent., and when at 6s. 3d. a duty of about 70 per cent.

29. The great staple of Pennsylvania is, as I have stated, almost universally excluded from the ports of Europe for domestic consumption, unless in the case of dearth. The great staple of South Carolina is freely received in every port in Europe—sells at fair prices—and commands cash. Yet Pennsylvania submits—and S. Carolina is preparing for rebellion, because “countervailing” duties have been imposed on English manufactures, to make a market at home for the bread stuffs rejected abroad!!

30. Ruinous and deplorable as a dissolution of the Union would be, it would not, at least for a considerable time, produce as much destruction and distress, as would immediately result from an abandonment of the protecting system.

31. The dissolution of the Union, and the resolving the United States, “into their original elements,” that is, separate confederacies, jealous of, and hostile to, each other, and the sport of foreign nations, would be a subject of universal rejoicing to despots and friends of despotism all over the world, and blast, and wither, and destroy the hopes entertained by the friends of mankind, of the practicability of republicanism—as we have had more advantages than any other nation ever had; and certainly at least as many as any other nation will ever have.

32. In the event of a dissolution of the Union, as sure as the sun shines, so surely shall we realize, in a greater or less degree, the deplorable scenes that have torn the governments of South America in pieces for twenty years; and our government will probably terminate, as some of theirs have done, in a despotism! And for what? on the construction of a clause of the Constitution, on which the nullifiers are in direct hostility with Gen. Washington, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Lowndes, Mr. Ames, and with Judge Cooper, in 1813, and Mr. Calhoun in 1816! Can history produce a stronger instance of dire infatuation?

After the reader has calmly and dispassionately considered the

above strong facts and fair deductions, let me ask him, in the language of Col. Drayton, who boldly heads the illustrious band who are struggling to preserve the sacred ark of the constitution :—

“ Shall we, instead of availing ourselves of that ‘ tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to prosperous fortune,’ abandon whatever is dear to us as patriots, whatsoever renown we have derived from our ancestors, whatsoever of glory we have acquired abroad, and whatsoever of liberty and happiness we have enjoyed at home; and rashly barter away these estimable treasures, to plunge into the vortex of Nullification ?”

I add the solemn adjuration of a patriotic Carolinian :

“ In the holy name of patriotism—in mercy to the whole human family of man—in gratitude to that God who has blessed us above every other people—Pause ! Pause, and reflect on the condition in which our state and nation are placed ! Reject from your confidence, men who are urging you to madness, to get rid of a system at a risk of revolution, which system they have been more than others instrumental in fixing on you. The same political blindness, which led them in the most vigorous periods of their youth and manhood, to involve this nation in the adoption of constitutional principles which they now say must work our utter ruin, should be a solemn warning, that they are not safe political guides. How in the name of God can you confide in the counsels of these men, when they now urge you to measures which may involve this state and yourselves in one common ruin—nay more, may lead to the dismemberment of this whole Republic ?”

We have seen three attempts to destroy the Union. Two of them, thank Heaven, failed. May the God of infinite mercy, who has brought the country through so many dangers and difficulties, defeat, and blast, and wither the third ! *“ So mote it be.”*

The language of the different periods is different—the motives assigned for action are different—the pleas of justification are different—but the grand object of all is the same—THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION—THE PERDITION OF THE SANGUINE HOPES OF THE FIRST AND BEST OF MANKIND THRO’-OUT THE CIVILIZED WORLD. LET ME ADJURE YOU, FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE SOUTH, BY THE IMMORTAL MEMORY OF THE ILLUSTRIOUS WASHINGTON—BY THE MOST NOBLE BEQUEST OF YOUR GLORIOUS ANCESTORS, WHICH YOU OUGHT TO BEQUEATH UN-DIMINISHED TO YOUR POSTERITY—BY YOUR HOPES OF HAPPINESS HERE AND HEREAFTER—TO ASK YOURSELVES THE QUESTION, COOLLY AND CALMLY, ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THIS HIDEOUS STATE OF THINGS, AND ITS INEVITABLE RESULT, CIVIL AND SOCIAL WARS ?

HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Sept. 10, 1832.

ERRATUM.—In the former Editions, page 25, it is stated that Mr. M'Duffie is a nullifier. This is erroneous, as he has declared his disapprobation of nullification.

